

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 4

July 24, 2018

331 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

In re Taijha H.-B. (Order), 329 C 914	74
Kutch v. Arisian, 329 C 530	48
<i>Zoning; whether trial court correctly determined that municipal regulation of signs erected on homeowner's residential property was outside scope of authority granted to municipality under applicable statute (§ 8-2); whether homeowner's signs disparaging remodeling contractor were "advertising signs" under § 8-2; interpretation of term "advertising signs" in § 8-2, discussed; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying zoning enforcement officer's request to enjoin homeowner from occupying her residence until she obtained certificate of occupancy.</i>	
Mendillo v. Tinley, Renahan & Dost, LLP, 329 C 515	33
<i>Declaratory judgment; whether trial court properly granted defendants' motion to dismiss; whether plaintiff's action was justiciable; whether trial court could afford any practical relief to plaintiff in action seeking judgment declaring that Appellate Court violated his constitutional rights in Sowell v. DiCara (161 Conn. App. 102) by upholding determination that plaintiff had violated Rules of Professional Conduct.</i>	
Walgreen Eastern Co. v. West Hartford, 329 C 484	2
<i>Property tax appeal; assessments; whether trial court correctly determined true and actual value of property in statutory (§ 12-117a) appeal by plaintiff; whether consideration of actual rental income is required by statute (§ 12-63b [b]) for valuation of property under income capitalization market approach; First Bethel Associates v. Bethel (231 Conn. 731), discussed; whether trial court's determination that property's highest and best use was as national chain pharmacy was clearly erroneous; whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiff failed to prove claim of manifestly excessive assessment pursuant to statute (§ 12-119).</i>	
Volume 329 Cumulative Table of Cases	75

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Barker v. All Roofs by Dominic, 183 CA 612	118A
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly affirmed decision of Workers' Compensation Commissioner determining that defendant city was plaintiff's principal pursuant to statute (§ 31-291); claim that § 31-291 was not intended to apply to governmental entities because such entities are not engaged in any trade or business, as required under § 31-291 for principal employer liability to attach; whether intermediate appellate court was bound by precedent from our Supreme Court; claim that establishment of Second Injury Fund abrogated case law from our Supreme Court establishing that municipality can be held liable as principal employer of uninsured subcontractor's employee; claim that board erred in affirming commissioner's finding that city was plaintiff's principal employer because roofing work that plaintiff performed for city was not part or process of city's trade or business.</i>	
Davis v. Property Owners Assn. at Moodus Lake Shores, Inc., 183 CA 690	196A
<i>Declaratory judgment; action seeking declaratory judgment to determine whether plaintiffs had easement by implication over real property of defendant property owners association; claim that trial court improperly denied motions to preclude expert testimony; whether plaintiffs were prejudiced by timing of disclosure of experts; claim that trial court improperly failed to grant easement by implication;</i>	

(continued on next page)

adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.

Gaskin v. Commissioner of Correction, 183 CA 496 2A

Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal from judgment denying habeas petition; whether appellate courts of this state have not yet addressed issues of whether petitioner procedurally defaults claim when his appellate counsel withdraws from representation without having investigated new information outside record that could develop due process claim or what constitutes cause and prejudice should such default exist; whether petitioner procedurally defaulted due process claim; whether trial record was inadequate for petitioner to have raised claim on direct appeal; whether petitioner established cause and prejudice even if he had procedurally defaulted his claim; whether habeas court improperly determined that petitioner did not establish cause where factual basis underlying due process claim was not reasonably available to petitioner until after his appellate counsel moved to withdraw from representation; whether petitioner established prejudice to overcome any procedural default where testimony of witness who cooperated with state was material to petitioner's conviction of murder and conspiracy to commit murder, petitioner's trial counsel was unable to get witness to admit to jury that witness had some promise from state regarding his cooperation, and prosecutor sharpened prejudice that resulted from witness' false testimony in closing argument to jury; whether petitioner's due process rights were violated by prosecutor's use of false testimony from witness who cooperated with state and prosecutor's suggestion to jury that witness who cooperated with state had no interest in outcome of petitioner's trial; whether witness' false testimony was material to petitioner's conviction; whether there was reasonable likelihood that witness' false testimony or prosecutor's reliance on it in closing argument could have affected verdict of jury; whether disclosure of agreement between state and cooperating witness needed to be made only to petitioner or whether disclosure also had to be made to jury; whether petitioner was harmed by lack of disclosure of agreement to jury where credibility of witness who cooperated with state was important, state's case was almost entirely dependent on witness' testimony and evidence of state's promise to witness bore on whether witness had anything to gain by testifying; claim that conviction of tampering with witness was buoyed by witness' false testimony and petitioner's conviction of murder and conspiracy to commit murder; whether jury reasonably could have found that petitioner attempted to induce witness to withhold testimony; whether tampering with witness could be established in absence of conviction of other crimes; whether false testimony by witness who cooperated with state was material to charge of tampering with witness.

Hilario's Truck Center, LLC v. Rinaldi, 183 CA 597 103A

Contracts; breach of implied contract; third-party beneficiary; whether plaintiff company that provided automobile towing services to defendant insured motorist had standing as third-party beneficiary to bring direct breach of contract action against defendant insurance company that provided automobile liability coverage

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*

Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

- to motorist; whether parties to insurance contract intended that insurance company should assume direct obligation to plaintiff where policy was devoid of any reference to plaintiff or to entities like plaintiff that might provide automobile recovery, towing and storage services to insured; whether contract language that obligated insurance company to pay for property damage evinced intent to create direct obligation to plaintiff that expended funds on behalf of insured to mitigate property damage suffered by others; whether denying plaintiff third-party beneficiary status undermined sound public policy.*
- Magee Avenue, LLC v. Lima Ceramic Tile, LLC, 183 CA 575 81A
- Contracts; unjust enrichment; whether plaintiff appealed from final judgment; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of individual defendant, who filed untimely affidavit in support of motion for summary judgment; whether trial court should not have considered untimely affidavit in granting motion for summary judgment; whether trial court improperly permitted and considered defendant's testimony during summary judgment hearing, which required court to make credibility determinations and factual findings; whether trial court improperly rendered summary judgment in favor of individual defendant on count alleging unjust enrichment where written motion for summary judgment was directed to two breach of contract counts only; whether trial court was free to render summary judgment on unjust enrichment count sua sponte.*
- Mercado v. Commissioner of Correction, 183 CA 556 62A
- Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of trial counsel; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; claim that petitioner's trial counsel had provided ineffective assistance by, inter alia, failing to object to use of testimony elicited from petitioner on cross-examination and from his former girlfriend in state's rebuttal, regarding whether petitioner acknowledged that he committed certain crimes in past; claim that trial counsel was ineffective in failing to object to evidence pertaining to petitioner's possession of certain assault rifle seized incident to his arrest and failing to present testimony from firearms expert to prove that assault rifle was not murder weapon; whether petitioner was prejudice by allegedly deficient performance of trial counsel.*
- State v. Ayala, 183 CA 590 96A
- Risk of injury to child; sexual assault in fourth degree; claim that court violated defendant's right to confrontation by failing to disclose redacted portions of victim's mental health records following court's in camera review; claim that trial court abused its discretion in its selection of records to disclose and those portions to withhold from defendant.*
- State v. Jackson, 183 CA 623. 129A
- Murder; conspiracy to commit murder; assault in first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying motion to preclude state's expert witness from testifying about cell site location information; whether trial court abused its discretion in denying request for six week continuance so defendant could consult with expert to rebut testimony of state's expert witness; whether defendant was prejudiced by denial of request for continuance; whether denial of request for continuance was harmful to defendant; unpreserved evidentiary claim that court improperly permitted state's expert witness to testify without first having conducted hearing as to witness' qualifications and reliability of his methodology; claim that rule enunciated in State v. Edwards (325 Conn. 97) that police officer must be qualified as expert witness before testifying about cell phone data applied retroactively to unpreserved challenges to evidentiary rulings; whether trial court abused its discretion in precluding defendant from presenting testimony by investigator to rebut testimony of state's expert witness; claim that defendant was deprived of right to present defense when trial court prevented him from introducing certain evidence; claim that trial court abused its discretion in concluding that proffered evidence of gun was too remote in time to be relevant to show lack of identity of defendant as one of shooters; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting consciousness of guilt evidence concerning defendant's failure to appear in court on unrelated matters subsequent to shootings; whether evidence of failure to appear in court was more prejudicial than probative.*
- State v. Rogers, 183 CA 669 175A
- Murder; conspiracy to commit murder; assault in first degree; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court improperly precluded defendant from introducing evidence that firearm used in shooting was found in possession of third party; failure of defendant to independently object to state's motion to preclude evidence or to attempt to introduce evidence himself; reviewability of unpreserved constitutional claim that trial court violated defendant's right to present defense when it precluded him from introducing alleged third-party culpability evidence; failure to request review of unpreserved claim pursuant to State v. Golding (233 Conn.*

213); reviewability of unpreserved evidentiary claim that trial court improperly permitted certain cell phone location testimony without first conducting hearing to determine reliability of witness' methodology.

Volume 183 Cumulative Table of Cases

231A

SUPREME COURT PENDING CASES

Summaries

1B

MISCELLANEOUS

Notice of Pendency of Reinstatement Application

1C
